



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

had no place on the program of the International Sunday-school convention held in Boston last June. Much peace literature was distributed there by one of our state superintendents of this department.

We are still threatened with that other dangerous element, the military drill in schools. After Senate Bill No. 1055 and others were introduced last winter, a memorial signed by our national president, corresponding secretary and your superintendent was submitted to the United States Congress, through the kindness of Hon. Nelson Dingley, of Maine.

Moral sentiment in favor of arbitration and compromise is advancing slowly but surely. The time is coming on apace when the gospel of the Prince of Peace will prevail throughout the earth and there will be both a brotherhood of men and a brotherhood of nations, all under the Fatherhood and government of God."

On June 20, 1895, at Amapala, the republics of Honduras Nicaragua and Salvador, by their representatives entered into an agreement for the formation of a new republic. The stipulations have been carried out and the Greater Republic of Central America is now a reality. President Cleveland officially recognized the new republic on the 23d ult., and in receiving its minister took occasion to express the hope that Costa Rico and Guatemala might soon become members of the new confederation. The governments of both these countries are favorable to the union, but cannot act without the approval of the legislatures. The Constitution of the new republic provides for the dropping of the word "greater" as soon as these two states enter into the Union. The new Diet has exclusive control of all foreign relations. This voluntary consolidation of the Central American States must inevitably result not only in greater peace on the isthmus, which has been the seat of so much strife and bloodshed, but in greater material prosperity also.

A correspondent in Rome of the London *Chronicle* has telegraphed that it is rumored that the European powers generally will give adherence to the arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain, and that Italy will be the first nation to signify its official approval. This is probably nothing more than a rumor, though it is not improbable that the Italian government is seriously thinking of asking to become a party to the treaty. The arbitration movement has made great progress in Italy. The government has already secured the insertion of an arbitral clause in many of its most important commercial treaties. More than a hundred members of the Parliament are already actively connected with the Interparliamentary Peace Union, and the numerous peace associations all over the peninsula are carrying on a vigorous campaign of education. There is no reason why the Italian government should not at once enter into treaty obligations to arbitrate all its differences with the United States and Great Britain.

Affairs in Cuba have given rise to much excitement during the month. The circumstances of Maceo's death have not yet been determined. In fact, it is not certain that he is dead. The latest information is that he is alive in a hospital and recovering from the effects of his wounds. Whether he was shot through treachery or in open fight, is also in doubt. The report that he had been treacherously ensnared and killed caused great indignation in this country, and in consequence many have offered their services for the Cuban cause. Filibusters continue to land supplies and men in Cuba, and neither our government nor Spain seems able to prevent it. Little is known of the location and movements of Gomez. General Weyler continues his operations in Pinar del Rio. He claims to have the province nearly cleared of insurgents. But some of the Spanish papers declare that he spends his time chiefly in killing *pacificos* (peaceful citizens), and threats are made of having him recalled for inefficiency. It is doubtful if he has made any progress in the suppression of the insurrection. There have been rumors of agreements between the United States and Spain to give peace and reforms to Cuba, but they are denied. Nothing is certain except that the bloody, beastly business of killing and burning goes on and the "Pearl of the Antilles" is turned into a veritable pit of demons.

An International Private Law Treaty, relating to Civil Procedure, the first of its kind ever made, was signed at The Hague on the 14th of November, by the representatives of Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Luxemburg, Spain, Portugal and Italy.

The 20th of December was observed as Peace Sunday in many parts of the land, and also in Great Britain and on the Continent of Europe. Large quantities of literature were sent out by the peace societies to ministers to assist them in preparation for the day.

EGYPT AND ENGLAND'S HONOR.

BY HODGSON PRATT.

I have been spending a fortnight in Paris, where I have enjoyed opportunities of conversation with several old friends and fellow-workers. They were all men of some mark, universally esteemed, and old admirers of England. Naturally we talked of the relations between the two countries, and I found all my interlocutors anxious to call my attention to the fact of the strong and almost universal animosity entertained in France at the present time towards our country. They deeply deplored the fact, and were most anxious as to its possible consequences. The British public is, of course, more or less aware of this unhappy state of things, but I hardly think they are much concerned about it, and they are too indifferent as to its causes, and as to the possibility of amelioration.

Surely this is a great error. Progress in the realiza-

tion of international concord based on justice, as well as the security and prosperity of nations, demand the existence of a permanent good understanding between them. Moreover, there are, I think, special reasons for desiring firm friendship and co-operation in all noble enterprises between the peoples of France and Great Britain. They have ever been characterized by attachment to great ideals, and have done much towards their realization in the world. In many respects the qualities of the one supplement those of the other. The serious consequences of the alienation between them stare us in the face, when we think of the awful catastrophe and shame of the present time. But for this alienation the Armenian horrors would probably have been checked at the outset. France and England united would have been able to alarm and control "the Assassin;" France would not, in her isolation of the last twenty-five years, have been obliged to seek an alliance with Russia; and we should not have now to deplore one of the greatest crimes of modern history as well as our utter failure to prevent it.

Now, why has this estrangement, involving such evil consequences, grown up? Its chief cause, according to the view of France, and to that of other states in a less degree, has been well set forth by my friend, M. Léon Marillier, in *Concord*, the organ of the International Arbitration and Peace Association. He is a man whose words well deserve attention—a Professor in the University of Paris, an eloquent leader in the French movement on behalf of the Armenians, and a hearty advocate of international peace. In describing the causes of French enthusiasm for the Czar as two-fold—the fear (1) of German domination and (2) of British domination—he says: "The most strange thing is that, although the Germans certainly have their share in this hatred and distrust of the foreigner, it is against the English that the desire to indulge it is most generally expressed." . . . "There remains the pretensions of England to universal domination (such at least are attributed to her), and her perpetual attempts at encroachment (real or pretended) at all points of the globe." . . . "But what proof could England furnish to Europe of her disinterestedness and the righteousness of her intentions? I know of one only—the evacuation of Egypt. What is felt in France as the great evil is not so much the fact that the English are in Egypt as that they remain there after having promised to leave."

I will next quote some observations made to me by a well-known deputy, a man of large commercial experience, an economist, and a man of very high character, who knows and appreciates our country. He said: "I have always recognized the presence in England of two distinct classes. One of them is humanitarian, devoted, above all things, to the cause of justice and right, possessing strong religious convictions. The other class cares only for the extension of the empire, of its wealth and power—to be obtained no matter how; and to the influence of this latter class are due such breaches of good faith and fair dealing as are seen in this case of Egypt." Unfortunately, the great majority of Frenchmen recognize the existence of the latter class only; and whatever act of violence and injustice is committed by an Englishman, in any part of the globe, is regarded as a characteristic national proceeding, sanctioned by the British people and government.

The prevalence of such an estimate of British character,

not only in France, but in other countries, will explain why our national uprising on behalf of the Armenians has been wholly misjudged. It was thought impossible that we should not be actuated by some selfish scheme of aggrandizement and ambition, such, perhaps, as the "annexation of Armenia." Consequently, Frenchmen who, under other circumstances, would have gladly welcomed our help in rescuing the Sultan's victims, have absolutely refused the co-operation of Englishmen known for their services in the cause, and willing to join the French movement.

Do not these facts make it the duty of all Englishmen to ask themselves honestly whether their proceedings abroad have or have not deserved such widespread condemnation and such general distrust of their good faith? Especially should we put this question to ourselves as regards the continued occupation of Egypt. Our unfulfilled promises in that case have, more than anything else, exposed us to condemnation and scorn. The services which we have rendered to the people of that country are great indeed, but they cannot outweigh the obligation we have incurred, by our repeated declarations, made long since in the face of all Europe. Well does the *Spectator* say, in reference to Bismarck's secret treaty with Russia: "Wholly apart from morality, nothing pays worse in politics than bad faith, which is exactly equivalent to loss of credit in commercial transactions. . . . It seems to us that the want of fidelity . . . is as fatal to the safety of the faithless Power as it is to her reputation."

The above observations are by no means intended as an argument for purchasing the friendship of France, or of any other country, by the abandonment of any duty towards Egypt. What we deny is that we have any duty there which can outweigh the discredit of not keeping our word—a discredit which must weaken our influence in the world, to say nothing of our security. In this matter we had far better follow the advice of such independent statesmen as Mr. Leonard Courtney, Mr. John Morley and Sir Charles Dilke than of men who have no faith in the inherent power of honesty in politics.

Now, as to the supposed duty to Egypt, I happen to have had, recently, some conversation with a most able and qualified witness, whose name, however, I am not authorized to give; I refer to an Englishman of great experience in administration, both in Egypt and in the Far East. In reply to my question whether "Egypt for the Egyptians" was a doctrine which could be put in practice, he said that the people of that country, like people everywhere, greatly preferred to manage their own affairs, instead of letting them be managed by foreigners. Moreover, he thought that the experiment could now be tried. Of course, the administration, he added, would not be so free from corruption and oppression, or so fruitful in material results, as under British rule; but the change would be agreeable to the people, and would relieve England from a great difficulty. He thought that the stipulation in the Drummond-Wolff convention, that British troops should re-enter if disorder arose, was most valuable. It would put the native rulers on their mettle, and make them take care that there should be no excuse for fresh occupation. It will be remembered that the French rejected the convention on account of this very clause. But, for their doing so, the British occupation would have ceased long ago.

In view of these facts, is there not urgent need that

the British people should come to an understanding with Egypt and with Europe, perform a great and obvious duty, and redeem the national reputation from the slur that has been cast upon it? More than once it has been shown in these columns that this is not an Anglo-French but a European question. Its non-solution has caused much evil, and will cause greater still, if not satisfactorily and honestly settled. It is the duty of Europe at large to safe-guard the rights and interests of Egypt; its neutrality and independence being guaranteed by the Powers; and due provision being made for the inviolability of the Suez Canal. In view of the great issues depending on some such equitable solution, affecting the honor of England, the welfare of Egypt, and the peace of Europe, it seems very desirable that special steps should at once be taken to educate and organize public opinion on that behalf. *Noblesse oblige!*—*The London Echo.*

THE VENEZUELAN SETTLEMENT.

BY PROF. THEODORE S. WOOLSEY,
of Yale University.

* * * * *

If we compare the adjustment which has been, or rather, promises to be adopted (for Venezuelan action has not yet been taken), with that which the President recommended a year ago, we shall find, however, an essential difference between the two. Let us recall the latter for a moment. The United States had suggested arbitration to Great Britain; but the latter had declined it, not, it is true, *in toto*, but as applicable to the entire region in dispute. The obstacle was that lands which had been long in the possession of British subjects might thus suffer a change of jurisdiction which their owners would find intolerable.

Thereupon, on December 17th, President Cleveland announced an ultimatum. Regretting the refusal of the British Government to arbitrate, "upon grounds which, in the circumstances, seem to be far from satisfactory," he proposed a United States Commission to determine the boundary line. After this should have been laid down, he advised that any claim of Great Britain to territory on the Venezuelan side of it, should be resisted by the United States by every means in its power. No sooner said than done. Congress as one man voted all that the President had proposed, and the Commission was duly appointed. It was excellent in its make-up, and tactful and conservative in its actions. And may we not find the principal proof of this in the fact that it has never made a report? For it became sufficiently clear before long that the Commission was a white elephant on the hands of the Administration. Had our Government taken a single step toward carrying out its program of forcing its own line down the throat of the British lion, it would have caused a great commercial panic, would have drained the Treasury of its gold, and would have brought about national bankruptcy or sunk us again to a paper basis. One cannot but suspect that Mr. Cleveland was very far from appreciating the full import and consequences of his December Message. As soon as he saw the construction which was everywhere put upon it, as soon as he saw the financial results which followed it, he became very much less aggressive and very much better informed. He is a man of sound common sense; he is incapable of making the same mistake twice. If this esti-

mate be correct, it is a key to the dilemma which confronted him. To back down was impossible; to go forward was disastrous; and the Administration realized the situation.

Nor was the British Government without its difficulties. Somewhat isolated in European politics—with France estranged on account of Egypt; with Germany out of sympathy through incompatibility of temper; with Russian antagonism always possible because of the irrepressible conflict of national interests; with all Europe sitting on the Turkish powder mine, afraid to stir lest an Armenian spark should ignite it—Great Britain, amazed and grieved rather than angry at our serious attitude, was by no means inclined to add to her burdens by war with the United States and, especially, by war over a trifle.

Thus everything made for peace and a settlement, and the settlement appears to have come; but it is not on the lines of last year's message. It recognizes the justice of the English contention in behalf of their long-established settlers by exempting all such who can prove fifty years holding under the British flag from the operation of the arbitration. To the international lawyer this provision is peculiarly interesting. Prescription is a recognized source of title in the law of nations; but with this serious defect, that there is no rule or authority to determine the length of time necessary to constitute prescriptive possession. In this particular case, however, by treaty agreement, this length of time is determined to be fifty years.

It may be worth noticing, also, that this is one more instance of *special* arbitration, which has been brought about by special agreement as to the conditions under which it is to be carried on. It was by the exemption of the fifty-year settlers, an exemption which a permanent court without permission or precedent could hardly have made, that an agreement was made possible.

If we are to regard the Venezuelan settlement as a "triumph of diplomacy," as it has been called, in the light of the foregoing, it is a little puzzling to say which diplomacy has triumphed. Is it ours which insisted upon arbitration and has got it, or is it the British, which refused arbitration unless the older settlements were exempted from it, and has accomplished that. Compared with the fact of peaceful settlement this question is of small importance, and peaceful settlement the action of the United States has undoubtedly helped to bring about.

Satisfactory as this main fact is, there is yet something curious and anomalous in the whole matter.

Here was a boundary controversy between a South American and a European State. We are told that its settlement through the action of the United States is "important to our peace and safety, essential to the integrity of our free institutions and to the tranquil maintenance of our distinctive form of government." To warrant such language as this it is necessary to believe that there was unjust encroachment on the part of Great Britain; that this might be followed by further encroachment and eventual control or absorption of the countries northward until the Isthmus was reached; that with accelerating speed the Central American republics might go down before the lion's paw like a child's clatterfence, with possession of the Inter-oceanic Canal, control of the Antilles, dominion over the vast Oriental trade of the future, and the downfall of our Republic as the results.